

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY  
CRIME PREVENTION ACT

## HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1999

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Juvenile Accountability and Crime Prevention Act of 1999. This act will provide communities with the ability to take a comprehensive approach to holding first and second time non-violent offenders accountable for their actions. Additionally, the bill allows communities—in a coordinated effort—to treat offenders on an individual basis, maximizing the chances that a juvenile will not re-offend.

The bill provides funding for Juvenile Accountability Coordinators who will:

Conduct an in-depth assessment of juvenile immediately upon arrest;

Contact the offender's parents or legal guardian, provide parents and guardians information on proceedings, needed services, and programs to help turn around the offender; and

Work with the juvenile, their parents, school officials, and law enforcement officials to develop an accountability plan for the juvenile. Failure of the juvenile to adhere to the plan would result in a referral back to juvenile court. Sanctions in the plan could include restitution to the victim, victim/offender mediation, community service, drug treatment and counseling, and a commitment to remain drug free.

In many localities, the courts are unable to provide swift accountability and individual attention to offenders. Sanctions specifically targeted to the individual juvenile which reflect the crime committed will decrease the likelihood of that juvenile re-offending. Additionally, bringing certain offenders out of the court system expedites the process and allows the courts to deal with more serious offenders.

This bill will help ensure that first and second time juvenile offenders don't fall through the cracks. Unlike other juvenile diversion programs, Juvenile Accountability Coordinators are with the juvenile every step of the way—from the time of arrest to the disposition of the case. They remain the focal point between parents, DAs, judges, schools, and the offender.

Should a second offense occur, coordinators provide consistency and detailed working knowledge of the offender and his or her circumstances.

This program has proven to be extremely successful on a smaller scale in Oregon. I would like to give other communities the opportunity to provide swift accountability and intervention to troubled young people.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. CHARLES F. BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1999

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, due to mechanical difficulties with my flight from my district I missed rollcall vote 428. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE  
REFORM ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

## HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 417) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment being offered by Congressmen BEREUTER and WICKER.

This amendment would bar legal permanent residents of the United States from being able to contribute to campaigns for Federal offices.

Legal permanent residents of this country are here in the United States working, paying taxes, fighting in the military, and they have even sacrificed their lives for this country. Twenty percent of Congressional Medal of Honor winners from our Nation's past wars were either legal permanent residents or naturalized citizens. In 1997, about 7,500 new recruits of the U.S. Armed Forces were legal permanent residents and currently, at least 20,000 members of the U.S. Armed Forces are legal permanent residents.

Legal permanent residents are often here in the United States to be with their close family members, to take jobs that no qualified U.S. citizens filled after the job was advertised, or to escape persecution. Unlike U.S. citizens, legal permanent residents must reside in the United States or risk having their residency status revoked. Legal permanent residents often send their children, many of whom are U.S. citizens by virtue of their birth in this country, to our Nation's public schools. They often participate in community and civic activities. As the "citizens in training" of our country, they have a stake in the future of our country and this amendment seeks to unfairly and unconstitutionally shuts them out of the political process.

This amendment restricts the right of legal permanent residents to express their political views, a right which is guaranteed to them,

and to us all, in the first amendment of our Constitution. Passage of this amendment will send a message to thousands of legal permanent residents that we as a nation want them to contribute to our economy, join our military, fight and die for our country but we do not want them to exercise their basic first amendment right.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in the landmark case *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976), ruled that campaign contributions are speech protected by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Nowhere in our Constitution does it state that the freedoms and protections provided in the Constitution apply to U.S. citizens only. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886) affirmed this sentiment by stating that, "... the Constitution is not confined to the protections of citizens." Also, in the case of *Bridges v. Wixon*, the Supreme Court held that the "freedom of speech and press is accorded aliens residing in this country." A letter sent to every Member of Congress, signed by 100 Constitutional law professors who teach all across the United States, affirms that the Bereute-Wicker amendment is unconstitutional. It would be unconscionable and beyond the scope of power of this Congress to pass this amendment and rob a whole class of people of a constitutional right.

I have tried to understand what my colleagues, Mistrs BEREUTER and WICKER, hope to achieve by introducing this amendment. Do they really believe that their amendment would keep foreign money out of Federal elections? I have read their amendment and I have analyzed what it would do the Federal election law. This amendment in no way makes it more difficult for foreign money to enter into the Federal electoral process.

Money from foreign sources is already illegal and this amendment does not change that fact. It has been expressed that we should pass this amendment to place a greater distance between foreign money and our Federal elections, that people who have not expressed a permanent allegiance to the United States should not have the opportunity to influence our Federal elections and that if permanent legal residents want a chance to express their voice in Federal elections they should just become U.S. citizens. These reasons are designed solely to be scare tactics and none of them hold any water.

If a foreign person wanted to illegally contribute money to a Federal election it is not necessary to find a legal permanent resident to be the conduit, any person, including any citizen could be used. There is no basis to assume that legal permanent residents are more likely to launder money from foreign sources than U.S. citizens. Therefore, how can the proponents of this amendment believe that it puts any greater distance between foreign money and federal elections? Permanent legal residents, by virtue of their legitimizing their

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

residency status, have expressed a permanent allegiance to the United States. They also express a permanent allegiance to the United States by volunteering to join our military and by sacrificing their lives in the defense of this country. To state that legal permanent residents should only be allowed to exercise their constitutional right of free speech when they become U.S. citizens displays a dangerous misunderstanding of constitutional law and overlooks the fact that many legal permanent residents are currently waiting for INS processing to become naturalized U.S. citizens.

This amendment will also have a discriminatory and embarrassing effect on the rights of U.S. citizens who are ethnic minorities. The amendment penalizes candidates who accept contributions from legal permanent residents. Therefore, in order to avoid violating the law, candidates will consider suspect any contribution contributed by a person with an ethnic or foreign sounding name. The contributor will likely be asked to verify his or her citizenship status. The prospect of having to endure humiliation such as this will make minorities more reluctant to participate in the political process. Considering that Asian-Americans and Hispanic-Americans already have low-voter turnout and political participation statistics, the effect this amendment will have is distressing. The effects will be particularly disastrous in those districts, like mine, that contain large minority populations. This amendment forces candidates to discriminate against people solely because of the way they look, because of a last name that is ethnic or foreign sounding, or because of their place of national origin. Any class of citizens having to prove their citizenship in order to exercise their basic first amendment right is an insult to all U.S. citizens.

This amendment which unconstitutionally denies legal permanent residents the protection of the first amendment right of free speech and which will cause a discriminatory and insulting effect on the rights of U.S. citizens who are ethnic minorities must be rejected. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Bereuter-Wicker amendment.

IN MEMORY OF PROFESSOR  
WILLIAM A. NIERING

**HON. SAM GEJDENSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 22, 1999*

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the sorrow felt by many across eastern Connecticut following the passing of Professor William A. Niering. Professor Niering was an extraordinary teacher, a pioneer in the modern environmental movement and a great American.

Professor Niering was a botanist by training and longtime professor at Connecticut College in New London, Connecticut. He was the first president of The Nature Conservancy. Founding in 1951, the Conservancy operates the largest system of private nature preserves in the world, including 1,500 in this country alone. As President of this organization, now one of the largest conservation groups in

America, Professor Niering was an early leader of the modern environmental movement.

Perhaps more than his work on behalf of conserving natural resources across the country, Professor Niering will be remembered in southeastern Connecticut as a beloved teacher who was dedicated to his students. He had an easy-going style and the ability to make extremely complex scientific principles understandable and exciting.

I have submitted an editorial which appeared in The New London Day which vividly describes Professor Niering and his many contributions to his students, his community and his country. His legacy will endure through his efforts to safeguard the natural bounty that makes our nation unique in the world and through the countless students he taught.

[From the New London Day, Sept. 1, 1999]

PROFESSOR WILLIAM A. NIERING

Professor William A. Niering died Monday as he had lived his life: exciting Connecticut College students about the joy of learning and discovery, and exhorting them to reach to the fullest of their potentials and the best of their instincts.

Dr. Niering, a botanist, led an accomplished life, and was recognized internationally for his research and environmental activism. But in spite of that celebrity, nothing pleased him more than working with young people in science and conservation. He died just after giving a lecture to students on the subjects of good citizenship and environmental stewardship. That was his commitment, educator and good citizen to the end.

Connecticut College has a consistent history of producing scholarly academicians who are also outstanding teachers. Dr. Niering was among the best of these throughout the college's long history. It would therefore be most appropriate for the college to create a special scholarship in his name, for it was his service to young people that he cherished above all else. Countless people would want to help create that memorial.

Dr. Niering, who with his longtime Connecticut College colleague Richard Goodwin was active in natural conservation and environmental causes, was the first president of The Nature Conservancy. The organization is now one of the major environmental institutions in this country.

Dr. Niering wrote a field guide on plants and flowers for the Audubon Society and organized one of the first college environmental studies programs. He served not only as an adviser to high-powered national groups, but more important, he served the southeastern Connecticut community in myriad ways that protected and enhanced the environment. He always had time to help local groups with environmental issues.

Quiet, modest and sincere to a fault, Dr. Niering nonetheless could demonstrate outrage when he saw people doing intentional damage to the environment. He never talked down to people whose scientific knowledge and education were much less than his own. Naturally easygoing, he had a relaxed style when he spoke. He always managed to explain complicated topics in terms the average person could understand.

Legions of college students flocked to his courses, both for the excellence of his teaching and the engaging way in which he welcomed students and helped them flourish.

Dr. Claire L. Gaudiani, Connecticut College president, explained his values well

when she said of Dr. Niering, "His generosity of spirit, his enthusiasm and his modesty were legendary."

The people of southeastern Connecticut join Dr. Niering's colleagues at the college in remembering this good and generous man whose life represented the best of what this country has to offer.

RECOGNIZING THE "SUITING UP FOR SUCCESS" PROJECT FOR STUDENTS

**HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 22, 1999*

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Suiting Up for Success project, which is a professional attire drive that benefits successful Fresno City College welfare-to-work students.

In 1998, management consultant and human resource specialist, Sue McCombs of McCombs & Associates created "Suiting Up for Success", in response to the Central San Joaquin Valley communities double digit unemployment rates. "Suiting Up for Success" is a professional attire drive that benefits successful Fresno College welfare-to-work students that has approximately 1,000 students enrolled. Last year, 3,000 suits were collected. The 1999 goal is to collect 5,000 suits. All Fresno area business professionals are challenged to donate unwanted men's and women's suits, blouses, skirts, men's shirts, slacks and ties. Business attire collected is made available through a "professional closet" operated and maintained by Welfare-to-Work students. The only beneficiaries of the "Suiting Up for Success" campaign are successful Fresno City College Welfare Reform students (graduates).

The project goals are to increase awareness of the welfare reform initiative and its impact on business owners. To provide our employees the opportunity to support and participate in the local welfare reform initiative. And to support and encourage current Fresno City College welfare program participants.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the "Suiting Up for Success" project, as they reach out to students who are less fortunate to have professional attire. I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing "Suiting Up for Success" many more years of continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. ESTHER DON TANG AND MS. PATTI TANG CROWLEY

**HON. ED PASTOR**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 22, 1999*

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Esther Don Tang and Ms. Patti Tang Crowley, this year's recipients of The Arthritis Foundation's Humanitarian Award.

In Tucson, Arizona, the names of this outstanding mother and daughter team are synonymous with community service, caring and